

Remarks

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 161-187, and 192-203 were pending in this application.

Claims 161-165, 168-170, 173-178, 181-183, 186, 187, and 199-201 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Rothmuller U.S. Patent No. 5,635,989 (hereinafter "Rothmuller") in view of Bedard U.S. Patent No. 5,801,747 (hereinafter "Bedard").

Claims 166, 167, 179, and 180 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Rothmuller in view of Bedard and further in view of Macrae et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0208756 (hereinafter "Macrae").

Claims 171, 172, 184, and 185 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Rothmuller in view of Bedard and further in view of Billock et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059581 (hereinafter "Billock").

Claims 192 and 193 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Rothmuller in view of Bedard and further in view of Lawler et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,699,107 (hereinafter "Lawler").

Claims 197, 198, and 202-203 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Rothmuller in view of Bedard and further in view of Williams et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,945,988 (hereinafter "Williams").

Summary of Applicant's Reply

Applicant has amended claims 161 and 174 to more particularly define the claimed invention, and canceled claim 164 without prejudice. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed and therefore do not add new matter. For example, support for the claim amendments can be found at least in page 24, line 21 through page 25, line 6 of applicant's specification. The rejections of applicants' claims are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's Reply

Amended independent claims 161 and 174 are directed towards a method and system for adding a program of interest to a watch list using an interactive television

program guide. A program of interest is added to the watch list in response to the user having watched the program for a specified amount of time. Programs of interest in the watch list are ranked based on the proportions of the programs watched. For example, according to applicant's specification, "[I]f the user has been watching a program for a specified amount of time, the program will be automatically added to the watch list. . . . Each of the programs may be assigned a ranking that is based on the amount of time that the user has spent watching the program. Program rankings may be adjusted depending on program type. For example, if interactive advertisements are shorter in duration compared to television programs, rankings of interactive advertisements may be modified to reflect this fact" (page 24, line 21 through page 25, line 6). Thus, applicant's invention as defined by amended independent claims 161 and 174 ranks programs in a watch list based on the proportions of the programs watched by the viewer.

Rothmuller discloses generating a favorite program list by storing in memory the titles of programs viewed for a duration of time that exceeds a predetermined period of time (col. 5, line 59 through col. 6, line 4). However, Rothmuller fails to show or suggest ranking programs in the favorite program list, let alone "ranking based on the proportions of the programs watched," as recited in independent claims 161 and 174.

Bedard relates to a system for creating a profile for a television viewer by monitoring the viewer's behavior and determining the viewer's preferred channels and program categories (col. 2, lines 6-13 and col. 3, lines 33-38). The viewer's preferred channels and program categories are determined by keeping a counter of the total number of "viewing units" watched by the viewer for each channel and program category. A viewing unit is defined as a period of 15 minutes (col. 3, line 63 through col. 4, line 15 and col. 4, lines 27-37 and 49-65). Even though Bedard monitors the durations of programs watched for each channel and program category, Bedard fails to disclose determining the proportions of programs watched, let alone ranking programs based on the proportions of the programs watched. Thus, applicant respectfully submits that Bedard does not disclose "ranking the programs of interest in the watch list based on the proportions of the programs watched," as specified in independent claims 161 and 174.

Furthermore, applicant respectfully submits that Macrae, Billock, Lawler and Williams also do not disclose "ranking the programs of interest in the watch list based on the proportions of the programs watched," as specified in independent

claims 161 and 174. Accordingly, whether taken alone or in combination, Rothmuller, Bedard, Macrae, Billock, Lawler and Williams fail to show or suggest "ranking the programs of interest included in the watch list based on the proportions of the programs watched," as specified in independent claims 161 and 174.

For at least this reason, applicant submits that amended independent claims 161 and 174 are allowable. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of amended independent claims 161 and 174 be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 162-173, 175-187, 192, and 193-203 also be withdrawn at least because claims 162-173, 175-187, 192, and 193-203 variously depend from allowable amended independent claims 161 and 174.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Baaba Andam/

Baaba Andam
Limited Recognition No. L0455
Agent for Applicants
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 75563
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8704
Tel.: (212) 596-9000